

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Sridhar and Thompson**

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,324,582 issued to Sridhar on November 27, 2001 and U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0075304 issued to Thompson dated June 20, 2002.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"one or more server components operable to communication with one or more router components, wherein the one or more server components employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, and wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of:

a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices;

an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and

a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and

wherein the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preference."

Sridhar does not teach or suggest these limitations. This is because Sridhar does not teach or suggest a "screening preference" as asserted by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 8. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically point out how screening is performed in Sridhar. Furthermore, even assuming that Sridhar teaches screening, there is nothing in Sridhar that teaches or suggests a screening preference that is an "alert preference". Thus, Sridhar is missing the "alert preference" element, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

The Office Action has cited Thompson only for its teaching that a network could be a home network or an office network. Thus, the Office Action seems to indicate, and applicant agrees, that Thompson does not supply the elements of applicant's claim 1 that were shown hereinabove not to be taught by Sridhar.

Therefore the proposed combination of Sridhar and Thompson does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicant's claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-14 and 22-23 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 15 and 21 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination of Sridhar and Thompson. For example, claims 15 and 21 recite, "wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preference". The proposed combination of Sridhar and Thompson does not teach or suggest this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 15 and 21 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 16-20 depend from claim 15, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Sridhar, Thompson, Conrath, Brooks and Maes

Claims 3-4 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar and Thompson, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,103,770 issued to Conrath on September 5, 2006.

Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, and Conrath as applied to claims 1-11, 14-17 and 19-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,047,305 issued to Brooks on May 16, 2006.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Conrath, and Brooks as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,801,604 issued to Maes on October 5, 2004.

Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Sridhar and Thompson being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preference", as recited in applicant's independent claims 1, 15 and 21, the combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Conrath, Brooks and Maes does not supply this missing element. Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicant's claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

Claim Amendment

Claim 23 has been amended to more clearly and particularly point out that which applicant regards as the invention and to improve its form generally.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

17

LUC-430/ Mutha 1


Conclusion

OCT 17 2008

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James Milton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: October 17, 2008

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC
Customer Number 47382